

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
10/559,090	11/29/2005	Simon James	21.1139	1254	
23718	7590 06/29/2006		EXAM	EXAMINER	
SCHLUMBERGER OILFIELD SERVICES			HELLNER	HELLNER, MARK	
200 GILLIN MD 200-9	GHAM LANE		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
SUGAR LA	ND, TX 77478	3663			
			DATE MAILED: 06/29/2000	DATE MAILED: 06/29/2006	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

		Application No.	Applicant(s)				
		10/559,090	JAMES ET AL.				
	Office Action Summary	Examiner	Art Unit				
		Mark Hellner	3663				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address Period for Reply							
WHIC - Exter after - If NO - Failui Any r	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATES as ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.13 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication. Period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period were to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, eply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing and patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	ATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION 36(a). In no event, however, may a reply be tim vill apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from to cause the application to become ABANDONEE	I. ely filed the mailing date of this communication. O (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status							
2a) <u></u>	Responsive to communication(s) filed on This action is FINAL . 2b) This Since this application is in condition for allowan closed in accordance with the practice under E	action is non-final. nce except for formal matters, pro					
Disposition of Claims							
4)⊠ 5)□ 6)⊠ 7)⊠ 8)□ Applicati 9)□	Claim(s) 1-8 and 11-14 is/are pending in the aptending of the above claim(s) is/are withdraw Claim(s) is/are allowed. Claim(s) 1,5,6,8 and 11-14 is/are rejected. Claim(s) 2-4 and 7 is/are objected to. Claim(s) are subject to restriction and/or on Papers The specification is objected to by the Examine of the drawing(s) filed on is/are: a) access	vn from consideration. relection requirement. r. epted or b) □ objected to by the E					
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a). Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d). 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.							
Priority u	inder 35 U.S.C. § 119						
 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f). a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of: 1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 3. ☒ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)). * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received. 							
2) Notice	t(s) e of References Cited (PTO-892) e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) r No(s)/Mail Date 11/27/2005	4) Interview Summary Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal Pa					

Application/Control Number: 10/559,090

Art Unit: 3663

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless -

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 1, 5, 6 and 8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Glenn, Jr. (4,114,721).

Glenn, Jr. disclose a method for acoustic detection of a leak behind the casing (11) of a borehole, the method comprising: using acoustic detectors (13a and 13b) to sample the acoustic amplitude during the time period that the detector is moved along the wellbore by a cable (14); defining time intervals inside the recording time period (the time used to further investigate the leak location); using spectrum analyzers (17a and 17b) to produce a power-frequency spectrum; analyzing the power-frequency spectrum by viewing the data on a recorded display (22 and 19) to identify the location of the leak.

The structure recited above broadly reads on claims 1, 5, 6 and 8.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

Application/Control Number: 10/559,090

Art Unit: 3663

Claims 11-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Glenn, Jr..

The subject matter of claims 11, 12 and 14 would be met by the addition of a step of repairing the leak in the casing detected by the device of Glen, Jr. by conventional repair methods notoriously well known to experienced well drillers.

This difference would have been obvious because the intention of leak detection is to locate areas for repair.

Claim 13 would be met by the addition of a second unspecified method of leak detection.

Using another method of leak detection would have been obvious because verification of the leak is important in view of the expense required by the down time dedicated to repair.

Claims 2-4 and 7 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. USPN 4,046,220 and USPN 3,588,800 disclose structure similar to Glen, Jr.

Any inquiry concerning this communication should be directed to Mark Hellner at telephone number 571 272 6981.

Mark Hellner

Primary Examiner

